

REMARKS

The present application was filed on September 26, 2003 with claims 1-20. Claims 1, 2, 16 and 20 have been amended, claim 21 has been added, and claim 4 has been canceled. Claims 1-3 and 5-21 remain pending and claims 1, 2, 16 and 20 are the pending independent claims.

In the outstanding Office Action dated June 3, 2005, the Examiner: (i) objected to the drawings; (ii) rejected claims 1, 3-7, 9, 10, 15, 16 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,414,299 (hereinafter "Wang"); (iii) rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of admitted prior art (APA); (iv) rejected claims 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,376,909 (hereinafter "Nelson"); and (v) rejected claims 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,233,220 (hereinafter "Lamson").

Applicant acknowledges the indication of allowable subject matter in claim 2. Claim 2 has been rewritten in independent form, incorporating the subject matter of original claim 1. Claim 2 has not been amended in view of the art provided by the Examiner.

With regard to the objection to the drawings, Applicant has amended FIG. 1 to illustrate wire bonds connecting the additional leads to the die within the package body. The specification has been amended to provide a reference numeral for the wire bonds. No new matter has been added.

With regard to the rejection of claims 1, 3-7, 9, 10, 15, 16 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Wang, Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite that the at least one additional lead is connect to the die and exposed adjacent to the die on an interior underside of the package body for connection to a circuit mounting structure trace passing between the adjacent leads separated by the space larger than the pitch. Support for the amendment can be found in FIG. 1 and page 5, lines 11-20 of the specification. Independent claims 16 and 20 have been amended in a similar manner.

Wang discloses a lower lead 202, which extends out from a package body with the other leads of the leadframe. Thus, lower lead 202 of Wang is not exposed adjacent to a die for connection to a trace. Additionally, lower lead 202 of Wang is not exposed on an interior underside of a package body for connection to a trace. Therefore, Applicant asserts that Wang fails to disclose the additional lead as recited in the independent claims of the present invention. Dependent claims 3,

5-7, 9, 10 and 15 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 1, and also recite patentable subject matter in their own right. Claim 4 has been canceled. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3-7, 9, 10, 15, 16 and 20 under §102(b) is respectfully requested.

With regard to the rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of APA, Applicant asserts that dependent claim 8 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency from independent claim 1. Dependent claim 8 also recites patentable subject matter in its own right. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 8 under §103(a) is respectfully requested.

With regard to the rejection of claims 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Nelson, Applicant asserts that dependent claims 11-14 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 1. Dependent claims 11-14 also recite patentable subject matter in their own right. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 11-14 under §103(a) is respectfully requested.

With regard to the rejection of claims 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Lamson, Applicant asserts that dependent claims 17-19 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 16. Dependent claims 17-19 also recite patentable subject matter in their own right. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 17-19 under §103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the above, Applicant believes that claims 1-3 and 5-21 are in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests withdrawal of the §102(b) and §103(a) rejections.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: August 31, 2005

Robert W. Griffith
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 48,956
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560
(516) 759-4547

Enclosures: Replacement Sheet for FIG. 1